



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/531,138	09/16/2005	Nicholas Andrew Murray Drought	920602-99275	4556

23644 7590 04/05/2006  
BARNES & THORNBURG, LLP  
P.O. BOX 2786  
CHICAGO, IL 60690-2786

EXAMINER

KUMAR, RAKESH

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3654

DATE MAILED: 04/05/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. 10/531,138	Applicant(s) DROUGHT ET AL.	
	Examiner Rakesh Kumar	Art Unit 3654	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 April 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 04/11/2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☒ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 03/20/2006.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

1. The listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609.04(a) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, unless the references have been cited by the examiner on form PTO-892, they have not been considered. In particular; see specifications page 1, line 12.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-7,10,11,15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by George et al. (U.S. Patent Number 5,909,822).

4. Referring to claim 1. George discloses an apparatus for releasing tablets (Figure 1A) from a blister pack (10) having a plurality of tablets (36) contained in corresponding blisters (30),

the apparatus comprising abutment means (20; Figure 1A), receiving means (12; Figure 1) for receiving a blister pack (10) with any selected one of a plurality of blisters (30) of the pack in registry with the abutment means (20), either one of the abutment means (20) and the receiving means (12) being moveable to cause a collapsing force to be exerted on a selected blister (30) thereby to release a tablet (36) from the blister (30),

wherein the apparatus includes biasing means (26) for urging the receiving means (12) into engagement with the blister pack (10), and

the receiving means (12) is so arranged that said engagement releasably retains, and locates (see member 128 engaging indentations 132; Figure 9A), the blister pack (10) in position relative to the abutment means (20) prior to the release of the tablet (36).]

5. Referring to claims 2,6,7 and 16. See claim 3 and 4. George discloses an apparatus for releasing tablets (Figure 1A) from a blister pack (10),

wherein the abutment means (20) is moveable towards a blister of a pack (10) retained in the receiving means (12). In addition, the biasing means (26) is integrally formed with the upper jaw.

6. Referring to claim 3. George discloses an apparatus for releasing tablets (Figure 1A) from a blister pack (10),

wherein the receiving means (12) is arranged to receive a blister pack (10) so that the selected blister (30) faces the abutment means (20), the latter being operable to exert said collapsing force by directly engaging the blister (30).

7. Referring to claim 4. George discloses an apparatus for releasing tablets (Figure 1A) from a blister pack (10),

wherein the receiving means (12) comprises a pair of opposed jaws (see member 12 in vicinity of member 16 around blister pack 10, there are a pair of upper and lower jaws used to hold the blister pack in place; Figure 1A).

8. Referring to claim 5. George discloses an apparatus for releasing tablets (Figure 1A) from a blister pack (10),

wherein one of the jaws (upper jaw; Figure 1A) is so shaped (see opening at cavity 112; Figure 9A) as to locate a selected blister (30) in registry with the abutment means (20), and has a recess of a complimentary shape to that of a blister (such that the blister pack 10 can be inserted into housing 12; Figure 1A).

9. Referring to claims 10,11 and 15. Regarding claim 10, George discloses an apparatus for releasing tablets (Figure 1A) from a blister pack (10),

wherein the biasing means (26) is operable to bias the jaws into a neutral position (see position of jaws in Figure 1A), in which they are spaced apart so as to be able to receive a blister pack (10).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

10. Claims 8,9 and 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over George.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Referring to claims 8 and 9. George discloses a tablet dispensing apparatus (Figure 9A) wherein the biasing means (104) comprises a resiliently flexible u-shaped (Figure 9B) connecting arm (102).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the biasing means (26) as taught by the George in the apparatus of Figure 1A and include a resiliently flexible u-shaped connecting arm (102; see Figures 9A and 9B) as a biasing means as taught in the apparatus of George

in Figure 9A and 9B because a biasing mean integrally formed on a resilient arm would reduce the number of parts in the dispenser thus reduce manufacturing cost.

12. Referring to claims 12-14. See claims above. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to use a compressible material as a biasing means, since applicant has not disclosed a compressible material solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose and it appears that the invention would perform equally well with a spring based biasing means as disclosed in the apparatus George in Figure 1A.

It would have been further obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified apparatus of George and include a compressible protective sleeve around the biasing member (26) thus preventing debris from entering the dispensing chamber.

### ***Conclusion***

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rakesh Kumar whose telephone number is (517) 272-8314. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00AM - 4:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kathy Matecki can be reached on (571) 272-6951. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

RK  
April 3, 2006



KATHY MATECKI  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600